

REMARKS

Claims 21, 22, 24-30, 32-35, 37-39, and 41-44 are currently pending in this application. No new claims have been added. Claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 have been amended, and claims 23, 31, 36, and 40 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed herewith.

Regarding the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 20, 2004, Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the listed references as acknowledged by the signed and initialed form PTO-1449.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the Personal Interview conducted on July 22, 2004. The amendments made to the claims presented above reflect the agreement reached by the Examiner and the Applicants in that interview regarding distinguishing the claimed invention over the cited prior art. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 21-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gilhuly et al (US 006701378B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 recite, among other things, selecting at least one application action associated with a selected application to be executed on at least one server, the application action comprising at least one of opening at least one file within the server, closing at least one file within the server, editing at least one file within the server, and searching at least

one file within the server. In an exemplary embodiment, request handlers may be located on at least one server, and may provide the ability for a request from the wireless client device to execute an application action associated with a selected application at the server (see the specification at page 12 line 16-page 13 line 2). The selected application action may include opening or closing an application at the server, opening, editing, saving, closing or deleting a document or folder at the server, searching a database at the server (see the specification at page 13 lines 3-8), or configuring user application preferences at the server (see specification at page 16 lines 6-20). This may allow wireless client devices such as cellular phones, interactive pagers, personal digital assistants, or another wireless client device, to access applications such as an email application, a calendar application, a personal directory application, a public directory application, or another application, on the at least one server (see the specification at page 16 lines 3-5).

In contrast, Gilhuly appears to disclose a system for continuously redirecting data items from a server to a user's mobile data communication device (see Gilhuly at the Abstract). Data items are forwarded by the system upon detection of user defined triggering events (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 14-20). Upon detection of a triggering event, the system of Gilhuly may re-package user selected items before pushing the items to the user's mobile data communication device (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 25-39). Thereafter, Gilhuly discloses that the user may select application actions to manipulate the items *located at the user's mobile data communication device* (see Gilhuly at col. 5, lines 44-63). In some embodiments of the system disclosed in Gilhuly, data items viewed and/or modified at the user's mobile data communication device may be transmitted, as complete data items, from the mobile data communication device to the server

(see Gilhuly at col. 3, lines 3-14). However, Gilhuly does not teach or suggest selecting at least one application action associated with a selected application *to be executed on at least one server*, the application action comprising at least one of opening at least one file within the server, closing at least one file within the server, editing at least one file within the server, and searching at least one file within the server.

In view of the foregoing differences between claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 and the cited art, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21, 28, 33, and 38 are believed to be allowable over these references. Further claims 22-27, 29-32, 34-37, and 39-44 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Dated: August 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram

Registration No.: 48,283

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO, P.C.

12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-464-4800

Customer No.
29315